

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-24 are presently active; Claims 1 - 8 and 25-45 were previously cancelled without prejudice. Claim 9 has been presently amended. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 9-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kubo et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,828,461).

M.P.E.P. § 2123 I states that a reference may be relied on for all it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art, including non-preferred embodiments. M.P.E.P. § 2131 requires for anticipation that each and every feature of the claimed invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.

Claim 9 as clarified recites:

A method for processing a print job, comprising the steps of:
entering, by a user, a print request for starting the print job from an application window;
displaying, in a one step response to the print request by the user starting the print job, a print dialogue box including print setting modification controls permitting change of the print settings from within the print dialogue box and including a print confirmation control;
confirming, by the user, by activation of the print confirmation control for a print setting confirmation of the print settings for the print job to be printed;
displaying, upon the activation of the print confirmation control and prior to processing of the print job for printing, a printing information dialogue box different from the application window and having a synopsis of the print settings for the print job including at least an indication of a paper selection; and
directing, by a user selection in the printing information dialogue box, the processing of the print job.

The feature of “starting the print job from an application window” is supported in Applicant’s specification by Figure 1 and the description thereof on page 3. The feature of “a printing information dialogue box different from the application window” is apparent from Applicant’s Figures 1, 2, and 3. The feature of “displaying, *in a one step response to the print request by the user starting the print job*, a print dialogue box including print setting

modification controls permitting change of the print settings from within the print dialogue box and including a print confirmation control” is a feature which Applicant submits is not disclosed or reasonably suggested in Kubo et al.

In the outstanding Office Action, the examiner stated with regard to the previously filed claims that:

Re claims 9-11, Kubo et al discloses (Figures 9A-10 & 12 and column 22, line 25 - column 25, line 30; particularly column 22, lines 25-33 and column 24, lines 18-33 & 53-56) a print control system in which a print dialog box 113 is displayed immediately (i.e. in one step) following the receipt of a print request (from "PRINT SETTING" button 95 in Figure 9A) with options for displaying and modifying print settings, including an indication of a paper selection, and a control for confirming and activating (the "SETTING" button 115) the print job using the print job settings as they are currently set. When "SETTING" button 115 is activated, Kubo et al discloses (column 25, lines 52-64) an automatic layout setting operation that includes an indication of the paper size (allowing it to be "changed as occasion demands").

However, when a user in Kubo et al enters a print request from the "PRINT SETTING" button 95 in Figure 9A, this print request does not originate from an application window. In other words, the "PRINT SETTING" button 95 in Figure 9A (which the examiner associates with a print request) appears in a secondarily generated screen after user in Kubo et al has elsewhere initiated a print request. For this reason alone, Claim 9 as clarified defines over Kubo et al, under the examiner's present reading of Kubo et al.

Furthermore, under the examiner's present reading of Kubo et al, the examiner associated the screen in Figure 9A with both the user-entered print request and the printing information dialogue box. However, in clarified Claim 9, the printing information dialogue box is different from the application window where the user-entered print request initiated. Therefore, Kubo et al does not meet the elements of clarified Claim 9.

Moreover, when a user in Kubo et al enters an initial print request for starting a print job, the user is shown *in a first step* Figure 9A of Kubo et al. Figure 9A is reproduced below.





FIG. 9A

If a user upon inspection of the status display shown in Figure 9A decides to change the print settings, then user must hit either the “ADD” or “PRINT SETTING” buttons in Figure 9A.

Once the “PRINT SETTING” button is activated, then the user is shown *in a second step* the dialogue box 113 in Figure 12 (reproduced below).



Thus, Kubo et al describe displaying a print dialogue box including print setting modification controls permitting change of the print settings in *a two-step display process* from the starting of the print job from an application window.


Hence, each and every element of Claim 9 is not shown in as complete detail as is contained in independent Claim 9.

Thus, Claim 9 and the claims dependent therefrom patentably define over Kubo et al.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Ronald A. Rudder, Ph. D.
Registration No. 45,618

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)
JJK:RAR:clh

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS (2006)\52440128\RESPONSETO OA071408-FILED.DOC